

AD 645285

# AN EVALUATION OF THE ROLE OF FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN RECRUITING SHELTER MANAGERS

Prepared for:

OFFICE OF CIVIL DEFENSE  
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

Under

CONTRACT NO. OCD-PS-64-57  
OCD WORK UNIT 1533A

|  |            |       |
|--|------------|-------|
| CLEARINGHOUSE<br>FOR FEDERAL SCIENTIFIC AND<br>TECHNICAL INFORMATION |            |       |
| Hardcopy   | Microfiche |       |
| \$3.00   | \$.65      | 59 pp |
| 1 ARCHIVE COPY   |            |       |

AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

September 1966

DDC  
RECEIVED  
JAN 5 1967

Distribution of this document is unlimited.

AN EVALUATION OF THE ROLE OF FEDERAL PERSONNEL  
IN RECRUITING SHELTER MANAGERS

(Final Report)

Prepared for:  
OFFICE OF CIVIL DEFENSE  
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY  
Under  
CONTRACT NO. OCD-PS-64-57  
OCD WORK UNIT 1533A

Prepared by:  
Frank B. Jeffreys  
Robert W. Smith

Social Systems Program  
Institute for Performance Technology  
AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

September 1966

OCD REVIEW NOTICE

This report has been reviewed in the Office of Civil Defense and approved for publication. Approval does not signify that the contents necessarily reflect the views and policies of the Office of Civil Defense.

Distribution of this document is unlimited.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| I. ABSTRACT . . . . .                                 | i           |
| II. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .                         | ii          |
| III. RESEARCH PROBLEM . . . . .                       | 1           |
| IV. APPROACH . . . . .                                | 4           |
| Obtaining Test Cities . . . . .                       | 4           |
| Efforts with the Local Civil Defense Office . . . . . | 6           |
| Treatment of Data. . . . .                            | 8           |
| V. CITY ONE CASE STUDY . . . . .                      | 10          |
| Summary of the Program . . . . .                      | 10          |
| Background Information . . . . .                      | 10          |
| Previous Selection and Recruitment Efforts . . . . .  | 11          |
| The Recruitment Program. . . . .                      | 12          |
| Results . . . . .                                     | 15          |
| VI. CITY TWO CASE STUDY . . . . .                     | 17          |
| Summary of the Program . . . . .                      | 17          |
| Background Information . . . . .                      | 17          |
| Previous Selection and Recruitment Efforts . . . . .  | 18          |
| The Recruitment Program . . . . .                     | 18          |
| Results . . . . .                                     | 23          |
| VII. CITY THREE CASE STUDY . . . . .                  | 25          |
| VIII. CITY FOUR CASE STUDY . . . . .                  | 28          |

TABLE OF CONTENTS Cont.

|   | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| IX. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .   | 31          |
| Summary of Results . . . . .  | 31          |
| Conclusions . . . . .   | 32          |
| X. REFERENCES . . . . .   | 34          |
| XI. APPENDIX A: Recruitment Aids Supplied by the American<br>Institutes for Research. . . . . | A-1         |

## ABSTRACT

The purpose of the present study has been to evaluate Federal personnel as shelter manager recruiters and to analyze the experiences of these recruiters in various metropolitan areas. The sample consisted of four cities from three of the eight OGD Regions. City 1 and City 2 conducted programs specifically for the study. Additional data were gathered from an on-going recruitment program in City 3 and from the efforts of an office building complex in City 4. City 1 and City 2 used personal contact with teams consisting of both Federal and local personnel. City 3 used personal contact by local personnel only, and the office building complex in City 4 recruited through a group meeting and letter campaign.

In City 1 and City 2, approximately one shelter manager per contact was recruited. City 4, using letters and a group meeting, recruited one shelter manager per 100 contacts. The cost of the recruitment programs in City 1 and City 2 was substantially below three dollars per recruited manager. In City 4, the cost was about seven dollars per recruited manager. In Cities 1, 2, and 3, some local workers had skills at least equal to those of the Region personnel. The Region personnel, however, did contribute impetus. Consistently, the Institute found reluctance at the Region, state, and local levels to use personal contact as a recruiting technique.

Four conclusions were drawn: (1) face-to-face contact is consistently successful in the recruitment of shelter managers, (2) personal contact doesn't require the use of Federal personnel, (3) civil defense workers are reluctant to use personal contact, and (4) Federal personnel provide impetus to the recruitment program.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The assistance of Region, state, and local civil defense workers, who helped in the planning and coordination of this project, is gratefully acknowledged. Particular thanks are due to the cities which conducted shelter manager recruitment programs, to the Region, state, and local workers who tirelessly made the personal contacts, and to the civil defense organizations which let the Institute observe their recruitment efforts. Mr. Fred Carr of the Office of Civil Defense made many helpful suggestions during the course of this project for which the authors are grateful.

## RESEARCH PROBLEM

During the course of a previous research effort for the Office of Civil Defense, the American Institutes for Research developed and evaluated guidance designed to be used by local civil defense workers who are recruiting shelter managers. The guide, The Selection and Recruitment of Shelter Managers (Smith and Jeffreys, 1965a) emphasized the use of two major concepts. The first concept was the need for shelter managers who have had management experience as part of their regular occupation. Successful performance of such a job requires most of the characteristics needed for effective shelter management. In addition, it is much easier to appraise a person's general job experience than to identify and measure all of the individual's characteristics which might be associated with shelter management potential.

The second major concept presented in the AIR selection and recruitment guide was the use of personal, face-to-face contact as a recruitment technique. Personal contact optimizes the opportunity for information exchange between the recruiter and the prospective shelter manager.

Combining these two concepts resulted in the recommendation that in most metropolitan situations the owner or manager of a building housing a shelter facility be requested by personal contact to provide shelter managers for the shelter in his building. It was felt that the building owner would probably be the best shelter manager and, if he couldn't serve, he would know the best way to select from his own employees. The local civil defense worker's task is to provide the owner with all of the necessary information about the shelter management job.

As part of the earlier research effort, these concepts were presented to many local civil defense workers, and without exception, they were

readily accepted. When the Institute's recruitment approach was used in field studies during earlier research programs, the recruitment efforts met with a great deal of success, measured in terms of both the number and the kind of shelter managers recruited.<sup>1</sup> Local civil defense personnel in most communities, however, were reluctant to employ the personal contact method. Two major reasons for this reluctance were identified. They are:

1. Personal contact to recruit each shelter manager places a much heavier work load upon the already busy local civil defense personnel than writing and mailing a form letter, preparing a press release, or any of the more traditional approaches to recruitment.
2. Local civil defense workers often lack the background and training required for effective personal contact and, realizing this, may feel anxious or pessimistic about personally contacting building owners or managers.  
(Smith and Jeffreys 1965b).

The use of Federal recruiters was tentatively advocated to overcome this problem. Compared with the local civil defense workers, the Federal recruiters would have the advantages of (1) training, (2) experience, (3) Federal status, and (4) time. These recruiters would go to cities to personally contact the owners or managers of the shelter facilities.

An opportunity arose during the earlier research program to observe such Federal recruiters participate in a recruitment program in a large Southwestern city (Smith and Jeffreys, 1965b). The efforts of the Federal recruiters (compared to local recruiters in other cities) met with spectacular success. Ninety-four license signers were visited by

---

<sup>1</sup>The phrase "number and kind of shelter managers" is used throughout this report. Number refers to the total number of selected and recruited shelter managers. Kind refers to the characteristics which the Institute feels are related to shelter management capability, and usually is expressed in terms of previous civilian management experience.

four two-man teams in one and a half days. Two of these owners/managers completed the form during the visit and the rest of them promised to complete the form and mail it back to the civil defense office. Three weeks after the visit, nineteen per cent of the owners/managers had returned the form. The background of those recruited was considered quite appropriate for the shelter management job. A sample of forty-seven of those selected and recruited contained only six custodial personnel; while more than fifty per cent of the sample was comprised of people who clearly hold management positions. The superior results of the Federal teams, compared to the local recruiting observed in that study, lent strong support to the concept of using special teams for the recruitment of shelter managers (Smith and Jeffreys, 1965b).

The purpose of the present project has been (1) to determine the representativeness of the results obtained by the Federal recruitment teams in the previous research and (2) to analyze the experience of such recruitment teams in other metropolitan areas for characteristics which influence their success or failure.

## APPROACH

### Obtaining Test Cities

The first step in the identification of cities for the sample was to discuss with government personnel the particular cities which seemed most appropriate for participation in the study. The relevant criteria for selecting a sample city included:

1. Size. The city had to be large, i.e., about one hundred marked and stocked shelters for which shelter managers should be recruited. A city with less than fifty shelter facilities wouldn't be included in the sample because the results would have been of minimal comparative value. Furthermore, conducting the research in larger cities would have reduced the chance of a single individual's influence being the key in the recruitment program's success or failure.
2. Marking and stocking. The cities in the sample had to have completed the marking and stocking of one half of the identified shelter facilities. Such cities could more reasonably have been expected to concern themselves with staffing their shelters with management cadres.

Region officials were contacted to obtain their cooperation in the study. The final selection of a city and the arrangements for its participation in the study were coordinated with the state, county, and local civil defense agencies involved. The sample was distributed over the country to permit an investigation of any geographical factors affecting the recruitment programs.

The final sample consisted of four cities from three of the eight Regions of the Office of Civil Defense. City 1 and City 2 conducted programs in connection with the AIR study, and both used the selection and recruitment techniques recommended by the Institute. Both programs had the backing of Region and state civil defense officials and both had at least one Region officer participate in the personal contacts. Additional data were gathered from a continuing recruitment program in City 3 and from a privately conducted recruitment effort in an office building complex in City 4.

City 3 used personal contact by local personnel only, and the office building complex in City 4 recruited through a group meeting and letter campaign.

#### Reluctance to Participate

It is important to note that resistance was met in one form or another during attempts to set up sample cities. In two Regions, the attempts to locate a sample city never progressed further than the Region headquarters. The Training and Education Director of one Region headquarter said he favored the program and promised to find a sample city. He was, however, never able to make arrangements. The Training and Education Director of another Region contacted the Institute to tell of his interest in the project. In several attempts to find a sample city, he met with extreme resistance at the state and local level, and ultimately, he could not set up a sample city.

Most of the reluctance to apply the guidance was encountered at the local level. After the Institute contacted the headquarters of another Region, City X was identified as a likely sample city. The local civil defense office was briefed on the program, and they expressed severe concern over the expense of the program. They admittedly had enough people to make the contacts, and both the state and Region offered personnel and training support. Although the recommended follow-up was merely mailing postcards to the facilities failing to register shelter managers, City X

felt that the follow-up would be prohibitively expensive. The local civil defense office also feared that the personal contacts would ruin the progress that has already been made. City X finally decided not to conduct a recruitment program. Resistance was also encountered in both cities that conducted programs involving Region participation. In City 1, the state civil defense office was not willing to participate. In both City 1 and City 2, local workers doubted that they could make their contacts in the limited time available and they feared that the contacts would harm the progress that had already been made. Mr. Green, City 2 civil defense director, said he resented having to do the program at that time, although both City 1 and City 2 were given complete freedom in scheduling the dates for the program. These remarks were interpreted as meaning that the Region or state had applied pressure to City 2 in order to get them to conduct the program.

#### Efforts with the Local Civil Defense Office

In City 1 and City 2 the work with the local civil defense personnel consisted of two phases. The first phase was collecting information on the community's previous selection and recruitment efforts. Specifically, information about the methods used in the earlier selection and recruitment program, who conducted the program, and the results of the program was sought. This information provided a baseline for the comparison of the results from the recruitment teams.

The second phase of AIR's efforts with these local civil defense personnel was assistance in establishing and implementing the recruitment program. This involved support in the form of guidance and advice to the local workers in the areas of scheduling, course development, public relations, and team coordination.

The recruitment program consisted of four steps. The first step in the recruitment program consisted of contacting those license signers who did not occupy their shelters. The purpose of these contacts was to get the license signers to recommend someone in their building to be contacted

about shelter managers. These preliminary contacts were to be telephone calls made by the local civil defense office. One week before the personal contacts were made, letters were sent to the building owners/managers telling them that shelter manager recruiters would be visiting them in the near future. An application form was included with the letter (See Appendix A).

The third step in the program consisted of the recruitment teams<sup>2</sup> going from building to building contacting the license signer or the person designated by the license signer. The teams were to discuss the problem of shelter management, request that shelter managers be selected and recruited from the building, and when possible, collect the completed application forms. Members of the staff of AIR observed the personal contacts for data gathering purposes and did not actively participate in the recruitment efforts. Such things as the type of approach used by the recruiter, the information transmitted, and the reactions of the shelter owners were the types of information sought during the observations. In addition, information on the results of the selection and recruitment program as a whole was collected.

The final step in the recruitment program was a follow-up campaign. This campaign was to consist of Institute-provided post cards and optional telephone calls to those license signers who did not return the application form. (See Appendix A for copies of follow-up materials).

In City 3 and City 4, the Institute's efforts were more limited. In City 3 information was gathered about both their background efforts in recruiting shelter managers and their present efforts. In City 4, information was collected on an on-going, concentrated recruitment program.

---

<sup>2</sup>The planned recruitment teams were to utilize Region personnel who have had experience contacting shelter owners, either in shelter licensing programs or in selection and recruitment programs. Approximately two Region personnel per sample case were required, and each person was needed for about two days. In addition, one day was required, per case, for administrative coordination. In all of the cities contacted about conducting a study for the AIR study, the local civil defense office wanted to be represented during the personal contacts. The teams, therefore, refer to the Federal recruiter and the local representative.

In City 1 and City 2, an attempt was also made to experimentally evaluate a recruitment brochure previously prepared by the Institute (Smith and Jeffreys, 1965a). The local civil defense offices were requested to enclose a brochure with half of the letters sent to the building owners or managers. Those receiving the brochures were to be randomly selected from the list of owners/managers to be contacted. The effectiveness of the recruitment program at the shelters receiving the brochure was to be compared with those which did not receive the flyer.

This attempt failed in both cities. The civil defense director of City 1 was so "pleased" with the brochures when he received them that he had them sent to all of the persons to be contacted within his city! When such an option was denied City 2 by limiting the number of brochures available, the brochures were enclosed with every other letter which was transmitted, but the local workers neglected to note which facilities received the flyers! It wasn't feasible to retrieve this data, because the Institute was not told about the omission until after the personal contacts.

#### Treatment of the Data

The case history method was used in this research program, i.e., a case study was written on the recruitment efforts of each sample city. While the total number of cases included in the sample is necessarily limited by this technique, it enables the researcher to investigate each case more intensively. The case history method enables the researcher to look realistically at the entire civil defense organization. It permits greater freedom in collecting data on the community's past selection and recruitment experiences, the environmental and social characteristics affecting the recruitment program, and any unanticipated, but apparently significant, variables which may appear during the program. Naturally, the representativeness of the results depends entirely upon the representativeness of the cities that are studied. As the sample size grows and as the sample cities become more representative of other cities, the validity of the results increases.

The results of the project were summarized in terms of:

1. Effectiveness of the test programs.
2. Cost of the programs.
3. Impact of OCD Region participation.

Finally, conclusions were drawn concerning the implications of this investigation for the selection and recruitment of shelter managers.

## CITY ONE CASE STUDY

### Summary of the Program

During the week of 24 May 1965, a pilot recruitment program was conducted in City 1. Thirty-seven personal contacts were made. Sixteen (42%) owners/managers agreed to send 27 shelter managers but did not sign them up during the contact. Eleven (30%) owners/managers agreed to send 20 shelter managers and signed them up during the contact. Thus, combining those signed up and those promised, each personal contact in the recruitment program resulted in 1.27 shelter managers. City 1 spent about \$100 on the program which is \$2.12 for each shelter manager.

### Background Information

City 1 has a population of over 200,000 people. Associated with City 1 are several cities which are politically separated rather than geographically separated. Only City 1, however, was included in the recruitment program.

City 1 and, more generally, the state, have an interesting civil defense situation. Because of the size of the state (it has 505 identified shelters and 360 of these are licensed), the state director plays a very direct role in local civil defense organizations. The training of shelter managers (as opposed to shelter manager instructors) is conducted by the state, and the state actively recruits the students for these courses.

The City 1 civil defense office is run by John White<sup>3</sup>. Mr. White is a full-time, paid city employee who has had extensive experience and

---

<sup>3</sup>All names in the case studies have been changed to maintain anonymity.

training in civil defense. Before directing the City I civil defense office, Mr. White was a successful insurance salesman. Mr. White, at the time of the recruitment program, headed a full-time staff of three assistants and two secretaries.

City I has 263 identified shelters. One hundred and twenty-nine shelters have been marked, stocked, and licensed.

### Previous Selection and Recruitment Efforts

Determining the effectiveness of previous selection and recruitment efforts in City I is compounded by the fact that both the state and the city have recruited within the city. Because of this duplication of efforts, it is impossible to evaluate separately the effect of the efforts of either the state or the city.

### City Efforts

Mr. White sent letters to all of the license signers in City I encouraging them to send shelter managers to the course offered by the state university extension. These letters were not followed up by personal contacts.

### State Efforts

Mr. Steel, the state civil defense director, reported that the state through the University Extension (CDUEP) had sent letters to the license signers of the largest shelters in the state asking for shelter managers. Mr. Bell of the University Extension later reported that he had sent letters to many shelters in the state and 126 of these shelters were in City I. In addition to sending the letters, Mr. Bell has spoken to various people about the shelter manager's course. He couldn't remember all of the people he had talked with.

## Results

The only data that are available on the results of both the state and the city recruitment efforts are the data collected by the University. Mr. Bell has trained seventy shelter managers from forty-one shelter facilities in City I. Based on occupational information on forty-eight of these shelter managers, 52% held non-management, non-professional jobs, 18% held nursing jobs, and 30% held middle or junior management jobs.

## The Recruitment Program

### Preparation for the Program

Before any building owners or managers were to be contacted, the civil defense director or a member of his staff, was to contact the absentee license signers, i.e., the owners or legal representatives of owners who do not occupy the shelter for which they have signed a license.<sup>4</sup> The purpose of these contacts with the absentee license signers was to get them to recommend someone in their building who should be contacted for shelter managers.

The local civil defense staff selected 50 shelters to which the recruitment letters would be sent. One selection criterion was specified by the civil defense office, i.e., only those shelters which had previously selected and recruited shelter managers were not included.

---

<sup>4</sup>There is reason to believe that this step was not taken. Before any attempts were made to contact the absentee owners, AIR was given a list of names of the people to be contacted and the building names and addresses. The contacts were made from this list and no alterations could be seen on the list. Furthermore, some of the personal contacts were with attorneys and/or real estate agents who represented buildings. These particular personal contacts were devoted to finding out who would be contacted about shelter managers.

The recruitment letters were sent to the fifty building owners/managers on May 17. (See Appendix A for a copy of the letter). A copy of the recruitment brochure developed by AIR was included in each letter. Two of the fifty letters were not deliverable and they were returned to the civil defense office. One of the owners sent back a completed registration form with the names of two shelter managers.

### Personal Contacts

The personal contacts began on Tuesday morning. The personal contacts were preceded by a short briefing session which consisted primarily of a "pep talk" by the civil defense director. The "pep talk" emphasized the need for developing and maintaining a positive attitude during the personal contacts. The civil defense director suggested that the recruiters approach the shelter owner/manager saying that they want to talk with him for a few minutes about his shelter facility. He also encouraged the recruiters to get the owners to sign up the shelter managers immediately if at all possible. The recruiters were told to introduce the AIR observers simply as members of the team. The first team consisted of Mr. Jones (local), Mr. Weeks (Region), and an AIR observer. Mr. Smith (local), Mr. McCann (Region), and an AIR observer were the second team. On the second day the AIR observers switched teams.

Each of the teams got half of the shelters to be contacted. Mr. Smith took the downtown buildings and Mr. Jones took the others.

Mr. Jones is a relatively young man who has just recently joined the City I civil defense staff. He nevertheless required very little help in answering questions about the shelter program or the need for shelter managers. He was very forthright and positive in his attitude--almost aggressive without being offensive. Mr. Weeks participated only minimally in the conversations, providing some technical information on occasion.

Often Mr. Jones commented that the Department of Defense was interested in the building owner/manager's response and that was the reason for the recruitment campaign. No one responded directly to this comment and it is impossible to assess its impact on the recruitment program.

The Jones-Weeks team made twenty-three personal contacts. Two additional shelters were eliminated because, although they were licensed, they were not large enough to be stocked, i.e., they had a capacity of less than 50.

Mr. Smith, the City Assistant Civil Defense Director, was previously the personnel officer for the city. He has a rather limited background in the shelter program and the need for shelter managers. Mr. McCann took a quite active role in supplying technical information.

Mr. Smith contacted shelters by alphabetical order rather than by location, thus spending an unnecessary amount of time traveling from one shelter to the next. For instance, he would travel four blocks from shelter A to shelter B and then travel back the same four blocks to shelter C which was next door to shelter A.

On some occasions when the shelter owners or managers offered to sign up shelter managers, Mr. Smith told them to wait and he'd be back later to get the names.

The Smith-McCann team made sixteen personal contacts. Two of these resulted in specific appointments to call back. Mr. Smith eliminated one of the buildings from the list of shelters he was to visit because it never signed a license and was not stocked. The researchers do not know what happened to the six or seven other contacts that the Smith-McCann team was supposed to make. Mr. Smith apparently used additional criteria to eliminate some of these shelter facilities.

The reactions of the owners/managers greatly resembled the reactions noted in a previous study (Smith & Jeffreys, 1965b). The managers were very gracious and most seemed to be amply aware of the need for shelter management. With one exception, the owners/managers who refused to sign up shelter managers were very cooperative. The reasons given for not signing-up shelter managers were lack of qualified employees, inability to pay the employees to take the training, and a reported lack of interest in survival among the potential shelterees.

## Results

The Jones-Weeks team made 23 contacts and the Smith-McCann team made 16 contacts. Of the 39 contacts, two were "call backs" for which definite appointments were made. In all calculations, these two shelters are not included.

Sixteen of the owners/managers said that they would send in the registration form but did not fill it out in the presence of the recruiters. These sixteen owners/managers gave reason to believe that they would send in the names of twenty-seven shelter managers. Thus, 42% of the interviewed owners promised to send in the names of shelter managers.

Eleven building owners/managers signed up shelter managers during the personal contacts. This was 30% of the people visited. These people signed up twenty shelter managers. Part of the information gathered on the application forms was the shelter manager's occupation. The shelter and the occupation of the signed-up shelter managers are:

- |                                     |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| 1. Salvation Army -----             | { Assistant Manager (Capt.)<br>(2) Mechanics              |
| 2. Electrical Manufacturing Co. --- | (2) Graduate Engineers                                    |
| 3. City 1 Boy's Club -----          | Director, Program Director                                |
| 4. XYZ Building -----               | (2) Commercial Artists                                    |
| 5. ABC College -----                | House Director, Social Director                           |
| 6. YWCA -----                       | { Director of Residence<br>Director of Building & Grounds |
| 7. DEF Press -----                  | Assistant Manager   |
| 8. Home for Aged Men & Couples ---- | { Executive Director<br>Registered Nurse                  |
| 9. F. W. Woolworth Co. -----        | Manager, Manager Trainee                                  |
| 10. MNO Building -----              | Superintendent  |
| 11. YMCA -----                      | Building Superintendent                                   |

Compared to the shelter managers that Mr. Bell at the University Extension has recruited and trained, the occupational background of the signed-up shelter managers is more compatible with the recommendations in the AIR selection and recruitment guide.

Cost Data

The following cost data were obtained from the City 1 recruitment program:

1 secretary for 1 day  
1/2 day for CD director  
2 1/2 days for one assistant  
1 day for the other assistant  
Stamps, paper, & envelopes for 50 letters

The probable cost of the program was about \$100. This figure of course doesn't include the salaries of the Region men or the AIR observers because City 1 didn't have to pay for them and the same number of contacts could have been made without their assistance. Thus the cost per recruited shelter manager (signed-up or promised) is approximately \$2.12.

## CITY TWO CASE STUDY

### Summary of the Program

On the 22nd of November 1965, a pilot shelter manager recruitment program was conducted in City 2. Thirty-six personal contacts were made. Only six of these contacts did not promise to send in the names of shelter managers. Since both teams discouraged the building owners from signing-up shelter manager during the contact, the total number of shelter managers recruited by the program can't be estimated. Data are available for the first of three courses offered. Since the program ended, thirty-one shelter managers have been signed up for this course. Thirty-five per cent of these held management positions. City 2 spent about \$85 on the program, which is approximately #2 per contact.

### Background Information

City 2 is a relatively prosperous suburb of a major metropolitan area. City 2 has a population of 116,000. It is closely tied with several other suburban cities, but for research purposes, the recruitment program involved only shelters within the city.

For communications in case of an emergency, the various cities surrounding the metropolitan area report into one of ten peripheral communications centers. These ten communications centers then report to one central communications center. City 2 is the peripheral communications center for the metropolitan area's northeastern suburbs.

Mr. Green is the civil defense director for City 2. The civil defense director is a full-time paid city employee. Before becoming CD

director, he was on the police force in City 2. He has had special training in traffic problems. Apparently he is most highly respected by the business and government communities in City 2.

### Previous Selection and Recruitment Efforts

Prior to the pilot recruitment program, City 2 had conducted six shelter management training courses for City 2 employees who were required to attend the course and for some students from surrounding communities. About 100 people have attended these courses. None of these people has been assigned as shelter manager for a specific shelter facility. The students for these courses were recruited from a general mailing, or more likely, were required to attend the course by the city government.

Twice a year, the City 2 Civil Defense Office sends out a brochure announcing what civil defense courses are being offered to the general public. About 13,000 of these brochures are mailed each time and about 50 people take the courses. Shelter management training, however, has never been offered as one of the courses in this training series. Thus, shelter management training has never been offered to the general population of City 2.

### The Recruitment Program

#### Preparation for the Program

The civil defense director was asked to develop a list of fifty shelters to be contacted. The final list contained thirty-five contacts representing one hundred ten shelter facilities which would shelter 105,329 people.

The local civil defense office set up three shelter management training courses before the letters were sent. The training course schedule was designed to provide maximum variety of time commitments. The first course was on January 18-19 (8 AM to 5 PM)--two working days. The second

course was on February 16-17 (7 PM to 10 PM) and February 18 (7 PM until 8 AM on the 19th)--two evenings and one night. The third course was on March 25-26 (7 PM on the 25th until noon on the 26th).

The initial contact letters were sent to the shelter owners/managers on November 12. A couple of registration forms were returned before the contacts began. Five students were signed up from these returned forms.<sup>5</sup>

### Initial Briefing

The purpose of the initial briefing was to let all of the people who were going to make personal contacts know what we were going to do and why, who AIR was, and generally prepare them for the personal contacts.

During the briefing, the Region representative, Mr. Black, presented some very strong arguments for the AIR shelter manager recruitment approach. He felt that personal contact with the building owners/managers is the obvious thing to do--the thing that businesses have been doing for years. In addition, he suggested an approach to recruiting which is based on alternatives. He said that one might tell the owner that someone would have to manage the shelter and if he didn't supply someone, the local government would. If the local government assigned someone to the shelter manager job, the owner would have no control over who was chosen. He also thought it was a very good idea to have the government hire teams of men to go from city to city to recruit shelter managers. He didn't say whether he thought this should be instead of local recruiters or in conjunction with local efforts.

Everyone present at the meeting seemed to know about the program; however, they did have some questions. Specifically, they wanted to know

---

<sup>5</sup>Before the personal contacts started, twelve additional shelter managers were recruited from a meeting that the civil defense director had with the City Manager. The City Manager agreed to send four city employees to each of the three classes.

what kind of results AIR had with similar programs elsewhere. Also, they expressed doubts about the possibility of contacting everyone on the list in two days with two teams. Almost all of those present doubted that they would be able to see the executives without appointments.

Mr. Green and Mr. Jamison (state representatives) were quite concerned that personally contacting the shelter owners would just give them the opportunity to demand that the OCD stocks be moved out. They didn't believe that this had never happened before.

During the briefings, the specific team assignments were made and the itinerary of contacts was developed. Mr. Green, Mr. Black (Region field officer), and an AIR observer were on the team that took the downtown shelters. Mr. Mattern, (City 2 fire chief), Mr. Gleaman (state training field officer and former training officer for City 2), Mr. Jamison (state representative), and another AIR observer were assigned to the team that contacted the peripheral shelters. After this initial division of shelters, Chief Mattern asked that two specific shelters (a college and one office building) be deleted from his list. The fire department had some unfortunate relations with these buildings and he felt that a fireman coming would ruin the contact.

#### Personal Contacts

Despite repeated requests for teams of three (one local representative, one state or region representative, and one non-participating observer from the Institute), Mr. Green formed a team of four for the peripheral contacts. Because Chief Mattern was busy in the morning, Mr. Schmidt took his place. Mr. Schmidt's job, fire inspector, routinely involves contacting building officials. He has also taken City 2's shelter management training course. For most of the contacts, Mr. Schmidt waited in the car.

Mr. Gleaman did most of the talking during the peripheral contacts. Before joining the State Disaster Office, Mr. Gleaman worked in the local civil defense office as the training officer. In that capacity, he had an opportunity to visit with the owners/managers when the buildings were being stocked. Before joining the civil defense staff, Mr. Gleaman was a fire inspector and, like Mr. Schmidt, made personal contacts with the building owners. Mr. Gleaman's approach during the personal contacts was excellent. He was brief, to-the-point, and he undersold his cause. With everyone he contacted, he was most effective. He seemed to be flexible enough to alter his approach from contact to contact. His personal contacts never lasted more than ten minutes.

After lunch, Mr. Schmidt left the peripheral team and Chief Mattern joined it. Chief Mattern presented the case for shelter management in very elaborate terms, and spent a great deal of time discussing disaster experiences not directly related to the shelter problem. From the manner of his presentation he appeared to anticipate extreme resistance. His contacts lasted about 20-30 minutes.

Mr. Jamison did not participate actively in the personal contacts.

The team composed of Mr. Green and Mr. Black took the downtown shelters. Because Mr. Black had to fly in from the Region headquarters, he was late joining the team. Mr. Green left the team later in the day for about two hours to attend a meeting.

Mr. Black appeared to be quite competent at personal contacts and he is an aggressive, dynamic, and talkative man. Before entering civil defense, Mr. Black was in the broadcasting business. During the personal contacts, Mr. Black would continue to sell the program well after the person would agree to send shelter managers. Typically, the owner/manager would be told about the courses, etc., and he would agree to send managers. However, Mr. Black would continue talking about the possibility of providing spaces for members of the employees' families.

In his personal contacts, Mr. Green was less talkative than Mr. Black. He would briefly state the purpose of the visit. When the owner/manager said that he'd send someone, Mr. Green left immediately. Mr. Green's contacts usually lasted about ten minutes. He didn't seem too anxious for the owners to sign up during the contact and he seemed to be apologetic for contacting them so soon before the courses. He said that the contacts were so early because the courses had to be set up and arrangements had to be made for instructors.

One characteristic of City 2 (or a characteristic of the shelters that were selected for contact), is the apparent high esteem which most people hold for Mr. Green and the civil defense effort. Even in those shelters which were reported to be problem shelters, the owners or managers were extremely cordial and almost without exception promised to send at least one person to the shelter managers courses. When the recruiting team visited the school system, the supervisor left a conference to meet with the team. At a very large college, the team had a meeting with a vice president, the director of physical plants, and the director of safety. Such eager receptions seem unusual for comparatively "cold" contacts. Two other incidents show this unique quality of City 2. First, one of the recruiting teams got into the wrong apartment building by mistake, but when the team's mission was explained, the owner wanted to send someone anyway. Second, Mr. Green had contacted the City Manager about sending city employees to the course. The Manager agreed to send 12 city employees and promised to send a memo to the various city departmental offices telling them about the course. The memo hadn't arrived, however, by the time the recruiting teams made their contact. Nevertheless, in all of the five or six city offices, except one, that were contacted, shelter managers were promised.

Another interesting anecdote happened at the Medical Building. The manager of this building said that he couldn't send anyone because he had only two employees. The manager said that if a tenant wanted the job, he could have it. So Mr. Green went to see his stock broker who has an office in the building. His broker agreed to attend the course.

It is interesting, and important, to note that many of the building owners/managers were ready to sign up shelter managers during the contact, and that both teams, for some reason, discouraged this. The teams gave the owners/managers stamped, self-addressed envelopes and asked that the registration form be mailed to the civil defense office.

Mr. Gleaman felt that he would have been more comfortable contacting some of the shelters if he had had an appointment. He felt that this was particularly true of the city schools and the college. Mr. Green thought that contacting some owners without an appointment would cause poor relations. Mr. Gleaman thought that the fact that more than one level of government was represented in the teams made a favorable impression on the owners/managers. It gave them the illusion that the state and Federal governments were interested in the problems of the individual shelter owner.

All of the recruiters expected a much bigger job. They were impressed by the fact that no one complained about the stocked supplies and that very few people asked long, involved questions about the shelter system.

When discussing the cause of the program's success, several factors were identified. First, when they signed the license, the signers were told that shelter managers would be solicited from their buildings. (This is not what the license said). Second, the city has an annual tournament which requires a great deal of planning and cooperation. Mr. Green feels that this community effort probably carries over into the civil defense efforts. And third, the community power structure is in favor of civil defense.

### Results

The results from the City 2 recruitment program are quite consistent with those of similar programs elsewhere. The recruiting teams received no direct refusals. Of the 36 shelters contacted, only six did not promise to send shelter managers. Two were Nazarene churches in which proper

authorities were not present. One was a private girls school and Catholic convent where the Mother Superior had just arrived from another assignment. She said she would try to find someone to go to the course. The fourth was the owner of a garage who said that none of his employees lived near the garage. The fifth was the director of the Health Department (he hadn't received either the letter or the City Manager's memo) who said he'd give it his consideration. And sixth was the Mutual Savings Bank where the manager wouldn't commit himself. He said he'd think about it.

Both recruiting teams discouraged the building owners from signing-up shelter managers during the contact. Therefore, no estimate of the total number of shelter managers promised can be made. At the time of writing, however, the City 2 civil defense office has received registration forms from 31 people (five of these are from the city departments) for the January 18th course. Thirty-five per cent of those shelter managers hold management positions, 20 per cent have supervisory positions, and 45 per cent have non-management jobs.

#### Cost Data

The following expenses were incurred by City 2 from the recruitment program:

- 1 secretary for one day
- CO director for 1-1/2 days
- Fire chief for 1/2 day
- Fire inspector for 1/2 day
- Stamps, paper, and envelopes for 35 letters

The probable cost of the program was about \$85. This figure of course doesn't include the salaries of Region and state employees or the AIR observers. Thus, the cost per recruited shelter manager (signed-up) is approximately \$2.74.

### CITY THREE CASE STUDY

During preliminary conversations with Region officials about obtaining test cities, the Institute was told that City 3 had been doing recruitment work quite similar to the approach AIR recommends. City 3 was too far along with their program to conduct a pilot recruitment program, but information about the city's efforts is of value.

All of the cities and towns in the county containing City 3 have decided to cooperate in financing one county-wide civil defense agency rather than each of them having their own agency.

Mr. Peirce has been the county civil defense director for about four and a half years. While Mr. Peirce was in the service during the Korean War, he was sent to a nuclear weapons school. He became interested in the nuclear weapons work and followed through with it when he got out of the service. He was working in the county personnel office when the county began to consolidate its civil defense efforts into one agency, and through this relationship he became the director. Mr. Peirce seems to have developed a very effective organization.

The City 3 civil defense office has 13 full-time employees. Most of these people are inspectors and secretaries. The City 3 civil defense training officer is Mr. Arnold. Mr. Arnold was a training officer with the Federal Civil Defense Office before he went to work with City 3 civil defense. Mr. Arnold is quite highly thought of and he has many excellent ideas.

For purposes of discussion Mr. Peirce divides his recruitment efforts into two periods. The first period was characterized by the use of a shotgun approach to recruitment and the use of the "standard" shelter management training course. The second period was characterized by the use of a

modified course and a strong emphasis on high-level management for shelter managers. The first shelter manager training course offered by City 3 attracted about 30 people, 60% of whom were women and almost all of whom were non-management, non-supervisory people. The students were recruited by "personal contact"; more specifically, they were acquaintances of civil defense staff members. The "standard" shelter management course was given and, according to Mr. Peirce, the results were quite unsatisfactory. The students were not interested in the material and both Mr. Peirce and Mr. Arnold felt that the course had failed to adequately train the students.

After this experience, Mr. Peirce and Mr. Arnold began to change both the course and their recruiting techniques. During the second phase, about 70-75 shelter managers have been trained. All have been recruited by the building auditors (local civil defense officers who periodically inspect the OCD shelter supplies) or by people who have completed the course. Eighty per cent of these men have management jobs and fifteen per cent have supervisory jobs.

Mr. Peirce feels that the nature of the shelter manager training course may strongly influence the success or failure of a selection and recruitment program. He therefore has developed a training course that he feels is most effective, both in training shelter managers and in the on-going shelter manager recruitment efforts. The current training emphasis is on specific technical information. They see the training course as an opportunity to introduce the executives to the probabilities of attack, the probabilities of fallout, and the probabilities of survival. The course covers, in detail, such theoretical topics as the effects of nuclear weapons (including fallout patterns and the radiological hazard), the characteristics of fallout and in-shelter operations. In addition, specific problems are solved and the students are instructed in the use of RADEF gear. The course is usually taught with three to eight students and can be compared to a top level seminar. Both Mr. Peirce and Mr. Arnold feel that teaching management principles and in-shelter psychological support is beyond the scope and purpose of the course and contrary to the interests of the students. Also, they feel that the type of manager that they want to recruit does not

need this type of orientation. All shelter management training courses are held during normal working hours on week days. (Mr. Peirce feels that this is somewhat of a selection criterion since generally only upper-level executives can arrange to take time off for shelter management training. Also, people with peacetime management jobs have other commitments on weekends and in the evening).

City 3 has found that this particular type of training course has been most effective with the type of shelter managers they have recruited. They have also found that a good training course competently conducted is the best recruitment aid. Some of the corporate executives who have taken the course have returned to their companies and sent other executives.

To recruit the shelter managers, Mr. Peirce relies primarily on the local civil defense auditors who periodically inspect shelter supplies. As a routine part of their inspections, the auditors talk about the shelter area and its supplies with the top executives of the building. During this conversation, the auditor tells the executive that the County civil defense organization offers a course in shelter management which goes into the problems in much more detail than the auditor can go into at that time. If the executive demonstrates any interest, Mr. Peirce follows-up this lead. The whole process is a "soft-sell" approach and it might take six months or a year to get an executive into a course.

Mr. Peirce feels that in his particular community an aggressive campaign would not be advisable. By an aggressive campaign, Mr. Peirce means one similar to the AIR approach where a letter is sent stating that recruiters will be visiting soon, the recruitment teams follow-up the letters, and then a follow-up campaign. Mr. Peirce feels that there is a very small power structure in City 3 and that it doesn't take kindly to such an approach. City 3 prefers the subtler approach of having the auditors discuss the courses with the executives.

## CITY FOUR CASE STUDY

During the course of the AIR study, a university extension course in shelter management was offered in City 4, a large metropolitan area in Northeastern United States. This course was scheduled for October 1964. In September a program to select and recruit students for the class was initiated in a large office building complex in City 4. This complex encompasses eight large office buildings housing 169 tenant organizations. Many of its 15,000 shelter spaces are located in an extensive underground parking garage. The complex has its own civil defense organization which has collected approximately \$46,000 to support its operation. The civil defense coordinator of this organization is Mr. James, Disaster Chairman for a large corporation and a nationally-recognized leader in industrial defense.

In conducting its selection and recruitment program, the complex's civil defense organization followed an approach quite similar to that recommended by AIR. The program was conducted through the owners or managers of the tenant companies. The officials behind the program recognized the desirability of management experience in the people selected for shelter management training.

The City 4 program was conducted under what appeared to be quite favorable circumstances. The complex contained many executive offices, and therefore more management potential was available for selection purposes than in a more typical "community". Further, the large operating budget of the civil defense organization seemed to indicate a favorable attitude toward its programs and finally, the people responsible for the recruitment effort were relatively high-level executives with the required ability for personal, face-to-face contact with potential shelter managers or their employees. The City 4 selection and recruitment

program departed from the approach recommended by the Institute by using letters rather than personal visits to contact tenant management. This program, therefore, provided comparative data for the evaluation of personal, face-to-face contact as a recruitment technique.

Mr. James initiated the selection and recruitment effort by sending a letter to the 169 tenants of the office building complex. This letter requested that they send a representative to a meeting to discuss the civil defense program. Fifty-four persons representing 46 companies attended this meeting. Plans for the shelter management training course were discussed and a request was made for students. Those tenants who did not attend the meeting were sent a second letter which contained an outline of the agenda, and mentioned the training course and the request for volunteers.

Mr. James then conducted a recruitment effort within the offices of his own corporation. This company has its own civil defense organization, which includes approximately 50 floor wardens who are responsible for evacuation procedures. Mr. James sent a letter to each of these floor wardens requesting that they attend two, day-long classroom sessions during the week. They were also requested to attend an occupancy exercise (Friday evening through Saturday) on their own time. Mr. James answered several questions concerning the course via telephone conversations.

Ten individuals from the office building complex attended the shelter management training course. Six of these persons, including Mr. James, were from his own company. One of the other four students was the Deputy Civil Defense Coordinator for the complex. Thus, slightly less than 3 per cent of the 169 tenant companies sent at least one representative to the class. Between 4 and 5 per cent of the individuals who got letters were students.

Specific data are not available concerning the occupations of those who received shelter management training. Considering the nature of the

office complex, however, it is probably safe to assume that the students were primarily management or clerical personnel. It is known that the class did include several executives.

Mr. James was unable to estimate the cost of his selection and recruitment program. The man-hour investment included the time required for Mr. James to draft the three letters and to conduct the meeting in September. The only additional cost was that involved in typing, reproducing, and transmitting the three form letters. Assuming that Mr. James required no more than half a day to prepare his three letters and another 1/2 day to plan and conduct the group meeting, costs for this program, including secretarial time and materials, could run as low as \$70, or approximately \$7 per recruited shelter manager.

In discussing the selection and recruitment effort with an AIR representative, Mr. James mentioned two modifications to the program which he feels would improve the response. First, he feels that the letters requesting participation in shelter management courses should come from the top management of the company which owns and operates the office building complex. He believes this would provide more status to the request and would indicate interest "from the top".

Secondly, Mr. James feels that shelter manager training courses should not include a shelter stay as part of the curriculum, and he plans to conduct such a course in the near future. He feels that the occupancy exercise requirement is a major deterrent to executive personnel who are considering shelter management training.

When the possibility of personal, face-to-face contact as a recruitment technique was suggested to Mr. James, he agreed that such an approach was the only way to "really convince people" about any aspect of the shelter program. He believed, however, that this would be an exorbitantly expensive approach to the selection and recruitment of shelter managers.

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

### Summary of Results

The results of this study may be summarized in terms of the effectiveness of the various programs which were investigated, their cost, and the role which Federal personnel played in these programs.

#### Effectiveness

An attempt was made to evaluate each selection and recruitment program according to the number of managers recruited per contact, and the cost of the program per recruited shelter manager.

Cities 1 and 2, which used personal contact by UCD Region personnel, acquired approximately one shelter manager per contact. The program conducted in City 4 obtained approximately one shelter manager for every one hundred letter contacts.

At least 65 per cent of those recruited in City 1 held occupational management positions, as did 35 per cent of those recruited in City 2. Ninety-five per cent of those recruited in City 3, which used personal contact without the aid of Region personnel, held management or supervisory positions. These figures represent a marked improvement over the results of previous selection and recruitment programs in Cities 1 and 3, where comparative data are available.

### Cost of the Programs

Cost data from the two cities using personal contact by Region personnel was remarkably consistent, and in both cases amounted to less than \$3 per recruited shelter manager. The letter-writing program in City 4 cost an estimated \$7 per recruited student.

### Impact of Federal Participation

The Region personnel who participated in this study did not demonstrate unique skills in personal contacts with building owners and managers. Local civil defense workers sometimes exhibited equivalent or superior ability in conducting the visits to shelter facilities, and considerable success was achieved by teams which did not include Region representatives.

The reluctance of local civil defense workers to implement the personal contact approach was observed as a major problem in this study, just as it has been in previous investigations. A major contribution of Region participation appeared to be that of overcoming this reluctance. They encouraged the local civil defense directors to take on the program, minimized the local worker's apprehensions about making personal contacts, and tended to keep the local personnel from going off on tangents irrelevant to the selection and recruitment program.

### Conclusions

Four basic conclusions may be drawn from this study. They are:

1. Personal, face-to-face contact with building owners and managers is consistently successful in the selection and recruitment of shelter managers, as compared to other methods which have been applied previously in the same locations.

2. The personal contact approach does not necessarily require the use of Federal personnel in order to be effective.
3. Local civil defense workers continue to demonstrate reluctance to implement the personal contact approach to selection and recruitment.
4. OCD Region personnel provide impetus to the selection and recruitment program by overcoming the reluctance of local workers and providing general guidance and support.

These findings indicate that effective selection and recruitment of shelter managers can be achieved by local civil defense personnel through personal contact with building owners and managers. OCD Region representatives can contribute to the selection and recruitment effort by providing the impetus required to overcome the local worker's reluctance to make personal contacts. Federal personnel need not participate in the actual contacts, but should provide direct administrative support to local officials in setting up the selection and recruitment program.

## REFERENCES

Smith, R. W. & Jeffreys, F. B. The selection and recruitment of shelter managers. Pittsburgh: American Institutes for Research, 1965.

Smith, R. W. & Jeffreys, F. B. The selection and recruitment of shelter managers. (A Technical Report). Pittsburgh: American Institutes for Research, 1965.

**APPENDIX A**

**Recruitment Aids Supplied by the American Institutes for Research**

INITIAL CONTACT LETTER

Dear \_\_\_\_\_ :

As you know, your building has been licensed and marked as a fallout shelter for use in the event of a nuclear attack. It also has been stocked by the Federal government with the provisions required to sustain its shelter occupants during an emergency.

A program is now underway to train qualified personnel to manage this community's shelter facilities should an attack occur. These shelter managers should be drawn from the group of people who occupy the shelter facility during peacetime. These individuals will be familiar with the shelter area and the people most likely to use the shelter during an emergency. In addition, they may have a particular sense of responsibility to their own building, its personnel, and its facilities.

The next three shelter manager training courses for this community will be conducted on \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, and \_\_\_\_\_, at the \_\_\_\_\_ Building shelter. Each class will provide \_\_\_ hours of instruction, including a 20-hour shelter occupancy exercise. We would appreciate it if you would indicate on the enclosed form the two individuals whom you would like to receive shelter management training, and the most convenient date for them to take the course.

Representatives from both the Department of Defense and the \_\_\_\_\_ Civil Defense will be visiting with you shortly to discuss the shelter management training program and to obtain the names of the individuals you have designated for shelter management training.

Sincerely yours,

Shelter Management Training Application Form

The following people have been designated by me as the persons I would like to have attend the shelter management training:

1. Name \_\_\_\_\_  
Address \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Phone \_\_\_\_\_  
Occupation \_\_\_\_\_  
Will attend the shelter manager's training course on (Check one):  
\_\_\_\_\_ (1st date) \_\_\_\_\_ (2nd date) \_\_\_\_\_ (3rd date)

2. Name \_\_\_\_\_  
Address \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Phone \_\_\_\_\_  
Occupation \_\_\_\_\_  
Will attend the shelter manager's training course on (Check one):  
\_\_\_\_\_ (1st date) \_\_\_\_\_ (2nd date) \_\_\_\_\_ (3rd date)

Submitted by:

Name \_\_\_\_\_  
Address \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

POST CARD

Please don't forget to enroll the people you have selected to attend the shelter management training course on:

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

AN EVALUATION OF THE ROLE OF FEDERAL PERSONNEL  
IN RECRUITING SHELTER MANAGERS

(Summary of Final Report)

Prepared for:

OFFICE OF CIVIL DEFENSE  
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY  
Under  
CONTRACT NO. OCD-PS-64-57  
OCD WORK UNIT 1533A

Prepared by:

Frank B. Jeffreys  
Robert W. Smith

Social Systems Program  
Institute for Performance Technology  
AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

September 1966

OCD REVIEW NOTICE

This report has been reviewed in the Office of Civil Defense and approved for publication. Approval does not signify that the contents necessarily reflect the views and policies of the Office of Civil Defense.

Distribution of this document is unlimited

## PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

In The Selection and Recruitment of Shelter Managers (Smith & Jeffreys, 1965a), the American Institutes for Research recommended that shelter managers have civilian management backgrounds and that they be recruited by face-to-face contacts. Further, based upon limited observations of Federal recruitment teams, the Institute tentatively advocated the use of Federal personnel to recruit the shelter managers (Smith & Jeffreys, 1965b). The purpose of the present study has been (1) to determine the representativeness of the results obtained by the Federal recruitment teams reported previously and (2) to analyze the experience of such recruitment teams in other metropolitan areas for characteristics which influence their successes or failures.

## APPROACH

### A. Sample

The sample for this project consisted of four cities from three of the eight Regions of the Office of Civil Defense. Two of the cities conducted recruitment programs specifically for the AIR study using personal contact by Federal and local personnel. Additional data were gathered from the continuing shelter manager recruitment efforts of a third city which used only local personnel and from a privately conducted recruitment effort in an office building complex in a fourth city.

### B. Recruitment Programs

For the two cities that conducted recruitment programs specifically for the study, the program consisted of four steps:

1. Contacting the license signers who did not occupy their shelters to find out who should be contacted about shelter managers.

2. Sending letters to building owners/managers telling them that a recruitment team would be visiting them in the near future.
3. Personally contacting the license signer or his representative to request that shelter managers be appointed.
4. Following-up those license signers who did not return the application form.

The Institute gathered data on each of these steps. The other two cities conducted their own programs without any assistance or suggestions from the Institute. The Institutes' efforts were limited to gathering information about their previous recruitment efforts and about their current programs.

Anonymous case studies were written for each city's recruitment efforts.

## RESULTS

### A. Recruited Managers

In both of the cities that conducted recruitment programs for AIR, the number of shelter managers recruited was significantly increased over the results of other recruitment techniques previously reported (Smith & Jeffreys, 1965b). In both cities, approximately one shelter manager was recruited per contact. The office building complex, using letters and a group meeting, recruited an average of one shelter manager for every 100 contacts. Also, in all three cities which employed the personal contact method, the civilian background of the recruited shelter managers was considered more appropriate than when other recruiting techniques were used.

#### B. Cost

The cost of recruitment programs in both cities was consistently low, averaging substantially below three dollars per recruited shelter manager. The recruitment program in the office building complex cost approximately seven dollars per recruited shelter manager.

#### C. Region Influence

Federal Region personnel participated in the recruitment programs in the cities conducting programs for AIR. In both cities, some of the local civil defense workers had skills in personal contacts that at least equalled those of the Region personnel. Even though the local workers were as effective, the Region personnel did contribute an intangible quality--namely, impetus. They encouraged the local civil defense directors to conduct the program, they minimized the local workers' apprehensions about making the personal contacts, and they tended to keep the local workers from going off on irrelevant tangents during the contacts.

#### D. Reluctance to Use the Guidance

Consistently, AIR found resistance to the use of personal contact as a recruiting technique. This resistance was found at the Region, state, and local level. Even in the cities which participated in AIR recruitment programs, local civil defense directors feared that personal contacts would ruin the progress already made. They also felt that it would take too much time to make the contacts and, in some cases, felt that it would be prohibitively expensive.

### CONCLUSIONS

Four basic conclusions can be drawn from this study. They are:

1. Personal, face-to-face contact with building owners and managers is consistently successful in the selection and recruitment of shelter managers, as compared to other

2. The personal contact approach does not necessarily require the use of Federal personnel to be effective.
3. Local civil defense workers continue to demonstrate reluctance to use the personal contact approach to recruitment.
4. OGD Region personnel provide impetus to the recruitment program by overcoming the reluctance of local workers and providing general guidance and support.

#### REFERENCES

- Smith, R. W. & Jeffreys, F. B. The selection and recruitment of shelter managers. Pittsburgh: American Institutes for Research, 1965.
- Smith, R. W. & Jeffreys, F. B. The selection and recruitment of shelter managers. (A Technical Report). Pittsburgh: American Institutes for Research, 1965.

Unclassified

Security Classification

DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA - R&D

(Security classification of title, body of abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the overall report is classified)

|   |   |
|---|---|
| 1 ORIGINATING ACTIVITY (Corporate author)<br>Institute for Performance Technology, AMERICAN<br>INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH, 135 N. Bellefield Avenue,<br>Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213 | 2a REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION<br>Unclassified |
|   | 2b GROUP  |

3 REPORT TITLE

AN EVALUATION OF THE ROLE OF FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN RECRUITING SHELTER MANAGERS

4 DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report and inclusive dates)

Final Report

5 AUTHOR(S) (Last name, first name, initial)

Jeffreys, Frank B.  
Smith, Robert W.

|                                  |                              |                      |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|
| 6. REPORT DATE<br>September 1966 | 7a. TOTAL NO. OF PAGES<br>38 | 7b. NO. OF REFS<br>2 |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| 8a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NO. | 9a. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)  |
| b. PROJECT NO.            | <del>XXXXXXXXXXXX</del>  |
| c.                        | 9b. OTHER REPORT NO(S) (Any other numbers that may be assigned<br>this report) |
| d.                        |  |

10 AVAILABILITY/LIMITATION NOTICES

Distribution of this document is unlimited.

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| 11 SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES | 12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY<br>Office of Civil Defense (OCD)<br>Department of the Army - OSA<br>Washington, D. C. 20310 |
|------------------------|--|

13 ABSTRACT

The study was designed to (1) evaluate Federal personnel as shelter manager recruiters and (2) to analyze their experiences in various metropolitan areas. The sample consisted of four cities from three of the eight OCD Regions. In the cities using personal contact, approximately one shelter manager per contact was recruited. In the city using letters and a group meeting, one shelter manager per 100 contacts was recruited. The cost of the recruitment programs in the first two cities was substantially below three dollars per recruited manager. In the third, the cost was about seven dollars per recruited manager. The Region personnel contributed impetus to the programs. Consistently, the Institute found reluctance at the Region, state, and local levels to use personal contact as a recruiting technique. Four conclusions were drawn: (1) face-to-face contact is consistently successful in the recruitment of shelter managers, (2) personal contact doesn't require the use of Federal personnel, (3) civil defense workers are reluctant to use personal contact, and (4) Federal personnel provide impetus to the recruitment program.

| KEY WORDS                     | LINK A |    | LINK B |    | LINK C |    |
|-------------------------------|--------|----|--------|----|--------|----|
|                               | ROLE   | WT | ROLE   | WT | ROLE   | WT |
| Shelter manager               |        |    |        |    |        |    |
| Shelter manager-recruitment   |        |    |        |    |        |    |
| Shelter management            |        |    |        |    |        |    |
| Selection - shelter manager   |        |    |        |    |        |    |
| Recruitment - shelter manager |        |    |        |    |        |    |
| Personal contact              |        |    |        |    |        |    |
| Personnel - OCD Regional      |        |    |        |    |        |    |

INSTRUCTIONS

1. **ORIGINATING ACTIVITY:** Enter the name and address of the contractor, subcontractor, grantee, Department of Defense activity or other organization (*corporate author*) issuing the report.
- 2a. **REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION:** Enter the overall security classification of the report. Indicate whether "Restricted Data" is included. Marking is to be in accordance with appropriate security regulations.
- 2b. **GROUP:** Automatic downgrading is specified in DoD Directive 5260.10 and Armed Forces Industrial Manual. Enter the group number. Also, when applicable, show that optional markings have been used for Group 3 and Group 4 as authorized.
3. **REPORT TITLE:** Enter the complete report title in all capital letters. Titles in all cases should be unclassified. If a meaningful title cannot be selected without classification, show title classification in all capitals in parentheses immediately following the title.
4. **DESCRIPTIVE NOTES:** If appropriate, enter the type of report, e.g., interim, progress, summary, annual, or final. Give the inclusive dates when a specific reporting period is covered.
5. **AUTHOR(S):** Enter the name(s) of author(s) as shown on or in the report. Enter last name, first name, middle initial. If military, show rank and branch of service. The name of the principal author is an absolute minimum requirement.
6. **REPORT DATE:** Enter the date of the report as day, month, year, or month, year. If more than one date appears on the report, use date of publication.
- 7a. **TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES:** The total page count should follow normal pagination procedures, i.e., enter the number of pages containing information.
- 7b. **NUMBER OF REFERENCES:** Enter the total number of references cited in the report.
- 8a. **CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER:** If appropriate, enter the applicable number of the contract or grant under which the report was written.
- 8b, 8c, & 8d. **PROJECT NUMBER:** Enter the appropriate military department identification, such as project number, subproject number, system numbers, task number, etc.
- 9a. **ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S):** Enter the official report number by which the document will be identified and controlled by the originating activity. This number must be unique to this report.
- 9b. **OTHER REPORT NUMBER(S):** If the report has been assigned any other report numbers (*either by the originator or by the sponsor*), also enter this number(s).

10. **AVAILABILITY/LIMITATION NOTICES:** Enter any limitations on further dissemination of the report, other than those imposed by security classification, using standard statements such as:

- (1) "Qualified requesters may obtain copies of this report from DDC."
- (2) "Foreign announcement and dissemination of this report by DDC is not authorized."
- (3) "U. S. Government agencies may obtain copies of this report directly from DDC. Other qualified DDC users shall request through \_\_\_\_\_."
- (4) "U. S. military agencies may obtain copies of this report directly from DDC. Other qualified users shall request through \_\_\_\_\_."
- (5) "All distribution of this report is controlled. Qualified DDC users shall request through \_\_\_\_\_."

If the report has been furnished to the Office of Technical Services, Department of Commerce, for sale to the public, indicate this fact and enter the price, if known.

11. **SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES:** Use for additional explanatory notes.
12. **SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY:** Enter the name of the departmental project office or laboratory sponsoring (*paying for*) the research and development. Include address.
13. **ABSTRACT:** Enter an abstract giving a brief and factual summary of the document indicative of the report, even though it may also appear elsewhere in the body of the technical report. If additional space is required, a continuation sheet shall be attached.

It is highly desirable that the abstract of classified reports be unclassified. Each paragraph of the abstract shall end with an indication of the military security classification of the information in the paragraph, represented as (TS), (S), (C), or (U).

There is no limitation on the length of the abstract. However, the suggested length is from 150 to 225 words.

14. **KEY WORDS:** Key words are technically meaningful terms or short phrases that characterize a report and may be used as index entries for cataloging the report. Key words must be selected so that no security classification is required. Identifiers, such as equipment model designation, trade name, military project code name, geographic location, may be used as key words but will be followed by an indication of technical context. The assignment of links, rules, and weights is optional.